TO:

		ACTION	INFO.			ACTION	INFO.
1	DCI			11	IG		
2	DDCI			12	D/PPB		
3	DDS&T		T	13	SAVA		~
4	DDI			14	ASST/DCI		
5	DDO			15	AO/DCI		
6	DDM&\$			16	EX/SEC		
. 7	D/DCI/IC			17	 		
8	D/ONE			18			
9	GC			19			·
10	rc			20			

	SUSPENSE	
--	----------	--

Remarks:

Approved For Relea \$\frac{\frac{1}{2}\text{065}}{23} JAN 1974\$\frac{1}{23} JAN 1974

DIK

Domestic briefings



371 - See the Time reported as may be lose may be lose from the form that want water all - fairly trumped to all -

THERE WAS ONE of those one-day wonders in the national news a few weeks ago concerning the allegations that the Central Intelligence Agency was using news correspondents around the world as sources. Actually, there was even more to it than that. Somebody at the CIA admitted that in some cases it wasn't just reporters moonlighting for the CIA, but CIA agents masquerading as newsmen.

It was a one-day wonder because the story was played prominently for one day and then it was pushed off of page one by the latest White House tape revelation or the news of the impending worldwide shortage of panty hose or hubcaps.

Many news organizations took this as a serious matter indeed.

Time, Inc. was one of the news organizations that viewed this situation dimly. In a letter to its correspondents and stringers (a stringer is a correspondent who doesn't have a very good expense account), Time's chief of correspondents said that the company had been in contact with sources in the CIA and had been assured that no employe, correspondent or stringer associated with Time was working for the CIA.

I HAPPENED to see a copy of the memorandum, and it is obvious in its tone and content that the company is deeply concerned with avoiding any conflicts of interest arising from that situation.

I did, however, find it curious, that passage about Time: having been in touch with contacts in the CIA for the assurances. Somebody with a suspicious turn of mind, like E. Howard Hunt, might construe that to mean that there was somebody in the CIA working for Time instead of vice versa.

Another passage in the memo was couched in language that is just more unfortunate than suspicious, when the chief of correspondents cautions the staff that "It is our belief that journalism is not compatible with intelligence work."

The memo concluded with a stern admonition from the chief of the news service to the effect that in case their information is wrong, and that there were some correspondents part-timing as spies, then the company would like to be informed, since it was grounds for immediate dismissal.

THE REASON I am bringing this up is because I believe that Time and Cosmopolitan and National Swine Breeder and the other media organizations are wrong in their opposition to having their staff writers work for the CIA.

I might add that it doesn't work too well the other way around, when the CIA works for the media. The resident CIA agent in Balch Springs used to be one of my principal sources, back a couple of years ago when I was printing a lot of wrong stuff.

But our country comes first, and the media should do whatever it can to make sure that our intelligence community gets accurate data, and incompatible intelligence.

In fact, I can think of several writers right here in Texas, especially the political analysts, whose reports would be of inestimable value to the CIA. If somebody like our gazette's Ron Calhoun, who understands Texas politics, could educate the CIA to the point where it understood Dolph Briscoe, the Connally-Yarborough feud, the intrigue on the Commissioners Court and the machinations of the City Council, then it would be child's play for them to unravel the simple gambits of the Arab sheikhs, the Chilcan juntas and the Soviet Praesidium. If they could learn what makes a county judge tick, our CIA analysts would find Chou En-lai a pushover.

Distribution:

Director

Deputy Director, Plans & Policy Agent 3468, Time & Life Bldg. Xerox to Joint Chiefs of Staff

STAT